

## REMARKS

### Claim Amendments/New Claims

In order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending Claim 1 and adding new Claims 17-35 of which Claims 17-19 are independent. Applicants are also canceling Claims 2-16 without prejudice or disclaimer.

More specifically, Applicants are amending independent Claim 1 and reciting in new independent Claim 17, a light emitting device comprising a plurality of light emitting units between two electrodes, wherein each of the plurality of light emitting units comprises a mixed layer comprising an organic compound and a metal oxide.

Applicants are reciting in new independent Claims 18 and 19, a light emitting device comprising a first light emitting unit and a second light emitting unit stacked between two electrodes, wherein a first mixed layer included in the first light emitting unit is in contact with a one of the two electrodes.

Support for these claims can be seen, for example, in Fig. 1 of the present application.

Applicants are also reciting in new dependent Claims 20-23 that an optical distance between one electrode and the light emitting layer is adjusted by a thickness of the mixed layer. This feature is supported by, for example, paragraph [0044] of the publication of the present application (US 2007/0176161).

Applicants are reciting in new dependent Claims 24-27 materials included in the mixed layer. These claims are supported by, for example, paragraph [0083] of the publication of the present application (US 2007/0176161).

Applicants are reciting in new dependent claims 28 and 29 specific examples of the metal oxide included in the mixed layer. These claims are supported by, for example, paragraph [0082] of the publication of the present application (US 2007/0176161).

Applicants are reciting in new dependent Claims 30 and 31 that the first electrode/the anode is a reflective electrode. These claims are supported by, for example, paragraph [0043] of the publication of the present application (US 2007/0176161).

Applicants are reciting in new dependent Claims 32 and 33 that thicknesses of light emitting layers are different from one another. These claims are supported by, for example, paragraph [0044] of the publication of the present application (US 2007/0176161).

Applicants are reciting in new dependent Claims 34 and 35 that color emitted from the light emitting layers are the same. These claims are supported by, for example, paragraph [0048] of the publication of the present application (US 2007/0176161).

Accordingly, no new matter is being added. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that these amendments and new claims be entered and allowed.

If any fee should be due for these new claims, please charge our deposit account 23/0920.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102/103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-3 and 7-16 under 35 USC §102(b) as anticipated, or in the alternative, under 35 USC §103(a) as obvious over Kido (Kido et al. (US 2003/0189401)). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, as explained above, Applicants are amending independent Claim 1 to recite that that

**each** of the plurality of light emitting units comprises a mixed layer (new independent Claim 17 has a similar feature). This feature is not disclosed or suggested in Kido.

In addition, Kido does not disclose or suggest the claimed feature of the first mixed layer is **in direct contact with the first electrode/the anode as** in new independent Claims 18 and 19.

Therefore, independent Claims 1 and 17-19 are not disclosed or suggested by Kido, and Claims 1, 17-19 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over Kido. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

### Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any further fee should be due for this amendment and/or the new claims, please charge our deposit account 23-0920.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: January 25, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/  
Mark J. Murphy  
Registration No. 34,225

Husch Blackwell LLP  
120 South Riverside Plaza  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 526-1533

Customer No. 24628